HMIS Oversight Committee Minutes
February 9, 2022
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Attendees: Patrick Crosby (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), John Noe (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Jonathan Russell (Bay Area Community Services), Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel), Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project), Dorcas Chang (EveryOne Home), Katie Haverly (EveryOne Home), Chelsea Andrews (EveryOne Home), Suzanne Warner (Office of Homeless Care and Coordination), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center)

1. **Welcome** (Mike Keller)   **9:00 – 9:05**

- Mike Keller (EOCP) announced that Tirza White is currently out on leave and that Chelsea Andrews and Katie Haverly will be filling in for Tirza.

2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes, 1/12/22**   **9:05 – 9:10**
   Action Item

- **Mike Keller (EOCP) made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.**
- **4 members approved. 0 Abstained. 0 opposed.**
- **Motion passed.**

3. **HMIS Oversight Public Comment**   **9:10 – 9:15**

- No public comments

4. **January HUD CoC Meeting: HUD CoC/HMIS Lead MOU &**   **9:15 – 9:35**
- **HMIS OC Workplan** (Nic Ming & Chelsea Andrews)
- Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) shared that data quality should be a standing monthly item. HMIS Committee should develop the workplan accordingly, to incorporate high level priorities agreed upon by HUD CoC Committee.
- The last HUD CoC meeting did not have a presentation on the Longitudinal System Analysis (LSA) or Point In Time (PIT) Count but they are on the agenda for the next meeting.
- Mike Keller (EOCP) made motion to approve work plan.
  - o The committee discussed approving the workplan.
    - ▪ Some members expressed concern about approving a workplan that still needs to be adjusted.
    - ▪ Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) responded that the approval of HUD CoC happened with the understanding that the workplan can be modified. She is concerned that delaying means that there is no course of action to follow and suggested a caveat with the motion.
    - ▪ Mike Keller (EOCP) shared that the committee is trying to approve the work

plan that can be modified and would be helpful to have a caveat.

- Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) shared that the caveat could include feedback from the workgroup and the HMIS Lead.
- Riley Wilkerson (HCD) emphasized the importance of setting up expectations that as it currently stands the workplan can't be met.
  - o **Jonathan Russell (BACS) seconded the motion to approve the work plan with the caveat.**
  - o **Motion passed.**
- Mike Keller (EOCP) shared that creating a monthly 2 hour workgroup would be helpful to accomplish as much of the workplan as possible. A doodle poll was sent out to the committee.
  - o The data quality action plan and the HMIS lead monitoring would be the first two topics.
  - o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) shared that there may be some revisions to the workplan that the workgroup could continue to evaluate.
  - o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) asked why the HUD CoC Committee would need to be apprised of the data quality action plan in February.
    - Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) shared that it may have been similar to the timeline from the year before. If there is a recommendation to hold until March from this committee, Chelsea Andrews could share with HUD CoC Committee.
    - Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) recommended going to the HUD CoC Committee in March for this.
  - o Based on the doodle, the times for the standing workgroup would be the first Thursday of the month from March 3rd either from 1pm to 3pm or 2pm to 4pm.
  - o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) asked whether other committee members could sit on the workgroup to support the efforts of the committee.
    - Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) recommended that other committee members be in the workgroup but that other committee members be invited in as guests.

The committee will review the work plan in April or May.

5. **Data Quality Action Plan** (John Noe & Nic Ming)   **9:35 – 10:05**

- o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) shared that the 2020 action plan was agreed to be outdated, and the data quality action plan needs to be revised. They spoke of the funder data liaison role supporting the monitoring of programs and data quality. They shared two documents regarding the proposed role of the funder data liaison (see google doc links below).

  HMIS Funders (Data) Liaison Role
  HMIS Funders (Data) Liaison Outline

- o Patrick Crosby (HCD) commented that the HMIS lead could potentially provide the toolset and let the agencies know how to manage and improve their data quality, but the impact of not doing that needs to rest in the CoC. He shared that the HMIS lead should have a role, but the responsibility should not rest with the HMIS lead.
- o Suzanne Warner (OHCC) shared that they have in a lot of situations where there are multiple funders for the same program. Going back to roles and responsibilities with

individual agencies needs to be taken into account.

o Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) asked how contract management takes place for HUD CoC recipients and what the role of the collaborative applicant is.

o Jonathan Russell (BACS) commented that it would be helpful to have by program/service type expanded and more robust data quality and outcomes built into contracts and there has to be expanded expectation in contracts.

o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) shared that the funder liaison can help with ensuring accountability as they will be a new stakeholder handling the engagement with the agencies which can expand how contracts get represented.

o Jonathan Russell (BACS) suggested that it would be helpful if there was a typology for different kind of contracts to make it easier to liaison. He also mentioned that there are also natural liaisons that would be natural fits for this role.

o Natasha Paddock (HCD) asked how the funder liaison role would roll out and how does it connect back to the HMIS Oversight Committee? Is this role someone who will seek out info from funders, compile that, and do analysis so we understand the data that needs to be targeted?

  o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) responded that this could function collectively and that perhaps HMIS Oversight monthly meetings could have an agenda item for this. The roll out start can happen from having conversations with the HMIS workgroup and have conversations and get feedback from funders.

o Natasha Paddock (HCD) commented there must be topical level of analysis and feedback to all the funders. This group can help set the tone and facilitate the messaging and set expectations for the level and quality of data.

o Jonathan Russel (BACS) shared that he liked how it provides an accountability channel that we have not had. These funder's liaison needs to be trained up on what those expectation is from the HMIS lead.

  o Mike Keller (EOCP) shared that his understanding of the data quality/liaison meeting could be space for training.

  o Jonathan Russell (BACS) clarified that the training would be help alleviate future burden from the HMIS Lead if the liaison knows the basics and had a robust understanding to hold accountability.

o Riley Wilkerson (HCD) added that we need to define what we mean by data quality and set up standards. He believes that the working group will be looking at the scope of what our data quality path is going to look like.

o **Mike Keller (EOCP) led a motion to explore this concept of a funder liaison and the data quality action plan in the workgroup and bring back to the committee. Josh Jacob seconded.**

  o **5 Approved. 0 Abstained. 0 Opposed.**

  o **Motion Passed**

o John Noe (HCD) reviewed the items that have been complete or ongoing from the current data quality action plan from 2020.

  o John Noe (HCD) will send the updated document for the committee for review.

  o Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) asked if there are any areas or items that seem missing that need to be represented moving forward in the data action plan?

    ▪ Patrick Crobsy (HCD) shared that one area that needs focus on is where in the CoC is the responsibility going to lie for compliance. Questions he posed include: what is going to be the response for poor data quality, who will reach out to the agencies, the CoC or the Oversight Committee?

    ▪ John Noe (HCD) agreed that there needs to be a more effective way to

approach compliance and doesn't want the current way that to carry over into the funder liaison role.

- Mike Keller (EOCP) shared that one approach for better compliance could be looping the funders into the discussion through the liaison if issues continue to persist.

.

6. HMIS Lead Monitoring (Mike Keller) **10:05 – 10:20**

- Due to time constraints, this item was skipped and will be explored in a workgroup.

7. Point-in-Time Count (Patrick Crosby) **10:30 – 10:40**
   Update

- Patrick Crosby (HCD) shared communications have been sent out to non-HMIS participating agencies regarding their HIC data. They started sending out data for review for permanent housing projects and rapid rehousing projects to start validating their data.
- Patrick shared the occupancy report. They are trying to see how the data is trending.
  - In January, occupancy counts are going down. This may be because some agencies are reviewing their occupancy and correcting the data.
  - Providers can see the last two numbers when they run the HIC report in HMIS.
  - Mike Keller (EOCP) shared occupancy could be down because of COVID outbreaks.
- Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel) asked what are we doing currently with the occupancy data?
  - The data is being shared with the HMIS Oversight committee. The agencies are made aware its being recorded.
- Natasha Paddock (HCD) asked where is the opportunity for programs to course correct?
  - Nic Ming (Social Action Center) suggested that this report can be included to the monthly meeting to the HMIS liaison so they can review and the meetings can be structured to include conversations about the report.
  - Tunisia Owens (FVLC) suggested taking a sample of agencies that are under their count and reach out to those agencies to get responses for why the data is that way.
  - Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) shared there could be an opportunity to provide context.
  - Natasha Paddock (HCD) wondered if the funder liaisons could help with this.

8. Longitudinal Systems Analysis (LSA) Report (Patrick Crosby) **10:40 – 10:50**
   Update
- Patrick Crosby (HCD) shared they are behind on LSA data. The good news is that they started with 4700 flagged errors and most have been attributed to and worked off by the vendor. Currently 240 errors are flagged and they are worked through figuring out which ones can be fixed.
- The deadline is next Tuesday.
- HUD chooses to compare the data to the HIC data. It is not a very comparable set of data because we do not include many projects from the HIC.

Proposed items for March 9 meeting **10:55 – 11:00**
- System Performance Measures

- HMIS Lead Monitoring
- Privacy & Security Policies
- Data Quality
- PIT Count